



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/789,143	02/27/2004	Jeffrey A. Tilton	25363A	9278
22889	7590	07/12/2005	EXAMINER	
OWENS CORNING 2790 COLUMBUS ROAD GRANVILLE, OH 43023			PIZIALI, ANDREW T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1771	

DATE MAILED: 07/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

MC

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/789,143	TILTON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Andrew T. Piziali	1771

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 February 2004.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 27 February 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/6/2004</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informality: Figure 3 is mentioned on page 5 of the specification, but there is no Figure 3. It appears that the applicant intended to refer to Figure 2. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over any one of USPN 5,616,408 to Olesczuk et al. (hereinafter referred to as Olesczuk) or USPN 5,804,512 to Lickfield et al. (hereinafter referred to as Lickfield).

Regarding claims 1 and 13, Olesczuk and Lickfield each disclose a liner/insulator comprising a first layer of wet processed mat, and a second layer of wet processed mat, wherein said first and second layers comprise thermoplastic polymer staple fibers and thermoplastic

bicomponent fibers (see entire documents including the paragraph bridging columns 11 and 12 of Oleszczuk and column 9, lines 12-20 of Lickfield).

Regarding claim 13, Oleszczuk and Lickfield each disclose that the layers may be thermally bonded (see column 8, lines 55-63 of Oleszczuk and column 9, lines 22-45 of Lickfield).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. Claims 2-5, 9-12, 14-15 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over any one of USPN 5,616,408 to Oleszczuk or USPN 5,804,512 to Lickfield (as applied to claims 1 and 13 above).

Regarding claims 2-5, 9-12, 14-15 and 19-22, neither Oleszczuk nor Lickfield specifically mentions a third layer of wet processed mat, but Oleszczuk and Lickfield each disclose that additional layers may be provided to form a liquid barrier, block airborne contaminants, or to provide additional support (see column 8, lines 64-67 and column 12, lines 2-4 of Oleszczuk and column 5, lines 1-4 and column 9, lines 18-20 of Lickfield). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a third layer of wet processed mat, because the additional layer would further impede liquid transmission, block airborne contaminants, and/or provide additional support.

Regarding claims 3 and 15, Oleszczuk and Lickfield each disclose that the fibers may be polyester, polyethylene, and/or PET (see column 8, lines 22-54 and column 12, lines 43-56 of Oleszczuk and column 3, lines 55-67 and column 10, lines 1-9 of Lickfield).

Regarding claims 4 and 5, Oleszczuk and Lickfield each disclose that the layers may be thermally bonded (see column 8, lines 55-63 of Oleszczuk and column 4, lines 59-67 of Lickfield).

Regarding claims 9 and 19, Oleszczuk and Lickfield each disclose that the first layer may be hydrophilic (see column 12, lines 31-43 of Oleszczuk and column 4, lines 1-17 of Lickfield).

Regarding claims 10 and 20, Oleszczuk and Lickfield each disclose that the first layer may be flame retardant (heat resistant) (see column 12, lines 31-43 of Oleszczuk and column 9, lines 52-63 of Lickfield).

Regarding claims 11 and 21, Oleszczuk and Lickfield each disclose that fibers of the second layer may be polyethylene (column 8, lines 22-54 and column 12, lines 43-56), which is inherently hydrophobic.

Regarding claims 12 and 22, Oleszczuk and Lickfield each disclose that the fibers may be natural fibers such as cotton or wool (see column 8, lines 37-54 of Oleszczuk and column 4, lines 1-17 of Lickfield), which are inherently sound absorbent.

6. Claims 6, 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over any one of USPN 5,616,408 to Oleszczuk or USPN 5,804,512 to Lickfield as applied to claims 1 and 13 above, and further in view of USPN 4,813,948 to Insley.

Oleszczuk and Lickfield are each silent with regards to specific layer thicknesses, therefore, it would have been necessary and thus obvious to look to the prior art for conventional thicknesses. Insley provides this conventional teaching showing that it is known in the nonwoven barrier fabric art to use layer thicknesses ranging from 0.02 to 4 cm (see entire document including column 3, lines 43-62 and column 11, lines 39-51). Therefore, it would

Art Unit: 1771

have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the layers with a thickness ranging from 0.02 to 4 cm, motivated by the expectation of successfully practicing the invention of Oleszczuk and/or Lickfield.

7. Claims 7-8 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over any one of USPN 5,616,408 to Oleszczuk or USPN 5,804,512 to Lickfield as applied to claims 2-5, 9-12, 14-15 and 19-22 above, and further in view of USPN 4,813,948 to Insley.

Oleszczuk and Lickfield are each silent with regards to specific layer thicknesses, therefore, it would have been necessary and thus obvious to look to the prior art for conventional thicknesses. Insley provides this conventional teaching showing that it is known in the nonwoven barrier fabric art to use layer thicknesses ranging from 0.02 to 4 cm (see entire document including column 3, lines 43-62 and column 11, lines 39-51). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the layers with a thickness ranging from 0.02 to 4 cm, motivated by the expectation of successfully practicing the invention of Oleszczuk and/or Lickfield.

8. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over any one of USPN 5,616,408 to Oleszczuk or USPN 5,804,512 to Lickfield as applied to claims 1 and 13 above, and further in view of any one of USPN 6,548,431 to Bansal et al. (hereinafter referred to as Bansal) or USPN 4,508,113 to Malaney.

Oleszczuk and Lickfield each disclose that the fibers may be bicomponent fibers comprising a polyethylene sheath (see column 12, lines 44-56 of Oleszczuk and column 10, lines 1-9 of Lickfield), but Oleszczuk and Lickfield are each silent with regards to a specific bonding temperature. Therefore, it would have been necessary and thus obvious to look to the prior art

Art Unit: 1771

for conventional bonding temperatures. Bansal and Malaney each provide this conventional teaching showing that it is known in the art to use a bonding temperature within a range of about 100 to about 150C (about 200 to 300F) when bonding polyethylene (see entire documents including column 8, lines 22-38 of Malaney and column 14, lines 37-52 of Bansal). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply heat at a temperature range of 200 to 300F, motivated by the expectation of successfully practicing the invention of Oleszczuk and/or Lickfield.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew T. Piziali whose telephone number is (571) 272-1541. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris can be reached on (571) 272-1478. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

atp


ANDREW T. PIZIALI
PATENT EXAMINER